

## **EXHIBIT 63**

### **Committee on Race-Neutral Strategy, Meeting of September 9, 2016 Minutes (UNC0283505-06)**

Committee on Race-Neutral Strategies  
Meeting of September 9, 2016  
Minutes

**Committee members present:** Rumay Alexander, Clinical Professor, School of Nursing, and Special Assistant to the Chancellor; Patrick Curran, Professor, Psychology and Neuroscience, College of Arts and Sciences; Michael Kosorok, Kenan Distinguished Professor and Chair, Biostatistics, Gillings School of Global Public Health; Holning Lau, Professor, School of Law; Ming Lin, Parker Distinguished Professor, Computer Science, College of Arts and Sciences; Abigail Panter, Professor, Psychology and Neuroscience, and Senior Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education, College of Arts and Sciences; Bettina Shuford, Associate Vice Chancellor, Division of Student Affairs.

**Committee members absent:** Douglas Shackelford, Distinguished Professor and Dean, Kenan-Flagler Business School.

**Guests present:** James W. Dean, Jr., Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost.

**Staff members present:** Stephen Farmer, Vice Provost for Enrollment and Undergraduate Admissions; Jennifer Kretchmar, Senior Assistant Director of Undergraduate Admissions; Barbara Polk, Deputy Director of Undergraduate Admissions.

Dean Abigail Panter, chair of the committee, called the meeting to order at 10a. She asked Provost Jim Dean to share his thoughts about the work of the committee.

Provost Dean said that the University is obligated by law to consider alternatives to any use of race or ethnicity in its admissions policies and practices. He also said that the University is obligated, both legally and as a matter of sound practice, to assess, measure, and improve its delivery of educational benefits to its students, including the educational benefits of diversity.

He said that the University, broadly speaking, prepares students to succeed in their lives, and specifically in their economic, civic, and personal lives. The educational benefits of diversity are crucial in preparing students in all three of these spheres. Because students will be working in an increasingly complex and multicultural world, their success will depend on their ability to understand, learn from, and work with individuals from many different backgrounds, whether they end up leading companies, contributing to teams, or starting new businesses. Diversity in our classrooms, residence halls, and other learning environments helps students develop these skills.

In regard to success in civic life, the University is obligated to prepare students to contribute to society, and students with little or no experience of diversity are ill prepared to be informed voters and to participate meaningfully beyond voting in the political process. In regard to personal success, the University aims to help students prepare for lives as family members, neighbors, and friends, and the educational benefits of diversity help students fulfill these personal responsibilities.

The committee then discussed the ways in which the experience of diversity contributes to critical thinking, and the ways in which critical thinking in turns contribute to success in all three of these

spheres and to the development of cognitive skills more generally. One member observed that the third sphere is in effect a form of character development, and that research has demonstrated the importance of patience, persistence, and empathy in the formation of character. Another member noted that ample research in business has demonstrated the greater effectiveness of teams that are more diverse in comparison to teams that are less diverse. Another observed that there is empirical evidence that the experience of diversity helps erode implicit bias. Another explained that non-diverse teams have developed products that failed because they did not adequately account for the needs and preferences of their market, which was much more diverse.

Another noted that an investment in diversity, broadly construed, is an investment in human capital: not only in the identification of talent no matter where it may be found, but also in the development of talent once it has been found, by bringing people together whose varied backgrounds and perspectives help all members of the group learn more than they otherwise would learn.

In response, Provost Dean said that the University wants every member of the campus community to thrive, and the community as a whole to flourish. UNC, as the first public university in our country, has a responsibility to all. He also said that admission is just the beginning: the University strives to have all students learn from, work with, and benefit from each other.

A member asked whether it would be possible to think of a willingness to interact with others—to be a “boundary spanner,” in the words of a former faculty member—as a criterion in admissions. Stephen Farmer said he believed that admissions officers already look for such a quality in candidates and could emphasize the trait more heavily if the faculty wished for them to do so. Another member suggested that such students could help in the development of other students who have potential in this area but have not yet enjoyed the same opportunities to practice this skill.

Following the discussion with Provost Dean, the committee approved the minutes of August 31, 2016.

Barbara Polk then invited questions about the 2015-2016 reading document, which the members had received in advance (and which follows these minutes as an attachment). In response to a question about how the admissions office reconciles the inherent subjectivity of admissions decisions with the need to be rigorous and fair, the committee discussed the ways in which members of the admissions committee exercise their judgment as individuals even as they learn from and calibrate with one another through committee discussions and other forms of feedback. The committee discussed how ratings are calibrated, with Ms. Polk observing that, while these ratings may describe various attributes of candidates, they do not define them or dictate their decisions.

A member of the committee observed that admissions decisions need to be both rigorous and subjective, and that the questions are how to optimize the process and what results the process should try to achieve.

Dean Panter adjourned the meeting at 11:30a.